

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
8 AT SEATTLE

9 GABRIEL ECKARD

10 Plaintiff,

11 v.

12 CHARLES MITCHELL, *et al.*,

13 Defendants.

CASE NO. C18-1810 RSM

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME

14 This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Gabriel Eckard's Second Motion for
15 Extension of Time to File Objections. Dkt. #31. For the reasons set forth below, the Court
16 GRANTS IN PART Plaintiff's Motion for a Time Extension.

17 On May 17, 2019, Magistrate Judge Michelle L. Peterson issued a Report and
18 Recommendation ("R&R") recommending that the Court grant Defendants' Motion for Summary
19 Judgment and dismiss this matter with prejudice. Dkt. #25. On June 4, 2019, the Court granted
20 Plaintiff's first request for a time extension and allowed him until July 8, 2019 to file his objections.
21 Dkt. #30.

22 Before the July 8 deadline, Plaintiff filed a second request for extension of time on the
23

ORDER GRANTING IN PART MOTION FOR
EXTENSION OF TIME
PAGE - 1

1 basis that he is only provided “3 to 6 hours of law library time a week” including computer access.
2 Dkt. #31 at 1. He also states that he is currently litigating “about 13 lawsuits and a criminal case”
3 and therefore requires more library access than he is currently being provided. *Id.*

4 Plaintiff has failed to demonstrate good cause for a second extension. Although the Court
5 has acknowledged inmates’ right to law library access and granted his previous time extension
6 request on that basis, *see* Dkt. #30, Plaintiff’s argument that he needs more access than what he is
7 currently being provided cannot reasonably be construed as an infringement on his right of access
8 to the courts. *See Lewis v. Casey*, 518 U.S. 343, 351 (1996). Because Plaintiff’s original deadline
9 expired before this Court ruled on his Motion, the Court will allow Plaintiff **seven (7) days** from
10 the date of this Order to file his Objections. If Plaintiff fails to file his Objections within this time
11 frame, the Court will consider them waived.

12 CONCLUSION

13 The Court, having reviewed the relevant briefings, does hereby find and ORDER that
14 Plaintiff’s Motion for Extension of Time (Dkt. #31) is GRANTED IN PART. Plaintiff’s time to
15 file Objections is within **seven (7) days** from the date of this Order.

16
17 DATED this 26th day of July 2019.

18
19 

20 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
21 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
22
23